

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Telephone Interview

The Applicant would like to thank Examiner Su for granting and conducting the telephone interview on October 29, 2010. Prior to the interview the Applicant's representative provided draft claim 19, which included amendments to more clearly define the structure required by the claimed invention.

During the interview, the Applicant's representative explained the clarifying amendments of draft claim 19, which clarify that, when the password received from the second electronic apparatus does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device: first the control device displays, on the display device, a request for the user to input a password via the input device; second the user inputs the requested password; and third the control device compares the password inputted by the user via the input device with the password stored in the first storage device, such that, when the password inputted by the user coincides with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device starts the operation of the first electronic apparatus.

Next, the Applicant's representative explained that Chou merely teaches, in the following order, (i) requesting the user to enter a password, (ii) if the password entered by the user does not match a stored password, then (iii) the user must provide an encrypted signature, (iv) a public key is used to decrypt the encrypted signature provided by the user, (v) the decrypted signature is compared to a serial number stored in the memory of the computer, such that (vi) if the

decrypted signature matches the serial number of the computer, then the user can enter an administration mode to select a new password.

The Examiner agreed that the above-mentioned order of operations required by Chou is different from the order of operations (structure) now required by draft claim 19. As a result, the Examiner kindly indicated that, if the Applicant amends the independent claims in a manner consistent with draft claim 19, then she would have to update her search.

II. Amendments to the Claims

In view of the above, independent claims 19 and 28 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited in above-mentioned draft claim 19, as discussed during the interview.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 19, 20, 22, 24-29, 31 and 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Stevens (U.S. 2003/0048174) and Chou (U.S. 5,892,906). In addition, claims 23 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Stevens, Chou and Karasawa (U.S. 4,786,900). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 19 and 28 and claims 20, 22-27, 29 and 31-36 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 19 recites a security system including a first apparatus and a second apparatus connected to the first apparatus. In addition, claim 19 recites that the second apparatus includes a second storage device previously storing a password and recites that the first apparatus includes a first storage device previously storing the password and a control device for requesting the password from the second apparatus. Further, claim 19 recites that when the

password received (by the first apparatus) from the second apparatus does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device: first the control device displays, on a display device, a request for a user to input a password via the input device; second the user inputs the requested password; and third the control device compares the password inputted by the user via the input device with the password stored in the first storage device, such that, when the password inputted by the user coincides with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device starts the operation of the first apparatus.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Chou for teaching the previously recited features of claim 19, which are related to the operation performed when the password received from the second apparatus does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device. However, in view of the above-mentioned amendments to claim 19, which clarify the order of operation when the password received from the second apparatus does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device, it is respectfully submitted that Chou and Stevens, or any combination thereof, fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned features recited in claim 19.

Rather, as mentioned above and as discussed during the interview, Chou merely teaches (in the following order) (i) requesting the user to enter a password, (ii) if the password entered by the user does not match a stored password, then (iii) the user must provide an encrypted signature, (iv) a public key is used to decrypt the encrypted signature provided by the user, (v) the decrypted signature is compared to a serial number stored in the memory of the computer, such that (vi) if the decrypted signature matches the serial number of the computer, then the user can enter an administration mode to select a new password (see Fig. 10, steps 118-124; and col. 9, lines 25-39).

Thus, in view of the above and as agreed upon during the interview, it is clear that Chou teaches that a user is prompted to enter a password, such that, if the password is incorrect, the user, instead of entering the password, enters an encrypted signature, but fails to disclose or suggest that, when the password received from the second apparatus does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device: first the control device displays, on a display device, a request for a user to input a password via the input device; second the user inputs the requested password; and third the control device compares the password inputted by the user via the input device with the password stored in the first storage device, such that, when the password inputted by the user coincides with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device starts the operation of the first apparatus, as required by claim 19.

In other words, even though Chou teaches entering an encrypted signature instead of entering the password, when the inputted password is incorrect, Chou still fails to disclose or suggest that, when two previously stored passwords do not coincide, requesting the user to input a password, such that the operation of the first apparatus starts when the inputted password matches the previously stored password, as required by claim 19.

Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, an object of the claimed invention is to avoid any unnecessary password requests from the user by comparing the previously stored passwords from the first and second apparatuses, such that the operation of the first apparatus will start if the previously stored passwords coincide. Additionally, as discussed above, only if the passwords from the first and second apparatuses do not coincide, will the user be requested to enter a password. In contrast, Chou teaches that first, the user is always requested to enter the password.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 19 and claims 20 and 22-27 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Stevens and Chou.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Stevens and/or Chou or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stevens and/or Chou to obtain the invention of independent claim 19. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 19 and claims 20 and 22-27 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 28 is directed to an apparatus and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 19. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 28 and claims 29 and 31-36 that depend therefrom are allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 23 and 32, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens and Chou (main references) in view of Karasawa (secondary reference), it is respectfully submitted that this secondary reference does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 19 and 28 which are lacking from the main references. Therefore, no obvious combination of the main references with the secondary reference would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claims 19 and 28 and claims 20, 22-27, 29 and 31-36 that depend therefrom.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Toru SASABE
/Andrew L. Dunlap/
2010.11.05 11:52:02 -04'00'

By _____
Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicant

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 5, 2010